

you have seen, some of the most articulate in this body in favor of lifting the embargo are Democrats. As I stated earlier, I strongly criticized President Bush's support for the arms embargo. As a matter of fact, I was encouraged when Governor Clinton, during his presidential campaign, advocated lifting the embargo. I am, of course, disappointed that now President Clinton has appeared so irresolute.

I believe the Bosnian crisis may permanently shatter the moral stature of our country. The crisis has already severely harmed the credibility of the United Nations. Much more importantly, it threatens the future of NATO, which had been the most successful military alliance in modern history. And it has put the United States—the world's remaining superpower—on the sidelines, while Bosnia burns.

Foreign policy should not be an exercise in naivete or cynicism. It should be a discipline requiring the highest order of judgment, soberly steeped in the awareness that the affairs of mankind are imperfect and recognizing that real options cannot offer panaceas to the bloody intents of the brutal. But U.S. foreign policy has often stood for more than the pragmatic: Our foreign policy, at its best, has been vitalized by principle.

We should be able to make clear distinctions about Bosnia. We should be able to declaim against genocide and put our actions where our denunciations are. We must abandon a policy that has been resolute in its lack of determination. We can make no argument for supporting an arms embargo that perpetuates genocide. And we must declare that we believe in the right of self-defense.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in just a minute or two I will ask that we stand in recess until 5:15 p.m., because the Republicans have a conference, and I think a number of my colleagues on the other side are at the White House discussing with the President the Bosnian resolution. There may be a chance we might bring up the rescission package tonight, too. I need to talk to Senator DASCHLE about that. So we will be under a strict time agreement, a limited number of amendments, and an agreement that the leadership on each side will vote against the amendments, as well as most of our colleagues, because this is something that has taken a long time because of a couple of Senators, who certainly are within their rights. But if we cannot reach that agreement, we will not bring it up.

I want to say just one additional word on this resolution.

Yesterday I addressed some of the criticism made by opponents of our legislation, and there are just a couple others I want to review at this point. The first criticism is that the legislation is unilateral in nature. Yes, this bill is unilateral. It provides that the United States will lift the arms embargo only after UNPROFOR withdraws—I would like to repeat, after withdrawal of the United Nations protection forces. This fact is being ignored by the administration and by some of our allies.

In my view, unilateral action as provided by this legislation is hardly a negative, but a positive. What the last 3 years of multilateral hand-wringing have demonstrated is that if the United States does not lead, action is not taken. It is time for leadership. We have been waiting, waiting and waiting for leadership. And so far nothing has happened. We are witnessing this right now. Thousands of civilians have begun to flee Zepa, as the Serbs close in. The United Nations has written Zepa off. And the hand-wringing is beginning with respect to Gorazde—the third eastern enclave. If Gorazde goes, that will be three out of six safe havens have been overrun. The French reportedly have a proposal for Gorazde that they are advocating. The British oppose stronger action and want the status quo. The White House spokesman says the administration is "leaning" toward action—but is not clear if the main objective is to forestall the fall of Gorazde or thwart this legislation.

In fact, the White House press secretary said this is a nutty idea. Well, I hope he tells that to Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator BIDEN and Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator FEINSTEIN and other Democrats who are supporting us. If it is a nutty idea, I am certain they would not want to have anything to do with it.

It is not a nutty idea. It is an idea we have been working on for years, Democrats and Republicans, to de-Americanize the conflict, lift the arms embargo, let Bosnia defend themselves without committing American troops. That is what it is all about. But I see an effort now by the White House at the last moment to stall and not have a vote on this legislation—always something better going to happen; just wait 1 more week, 1 more month. We waited 11 months. It has been 11 months since we had a vote.

In any event, leaning toward more aggressive action is not a substitute for aggressive action. And this is not for airstrikes, which the White House appears to be considering. The obstacle to airstrikes has been and continues to be opposition from some of our allies; namely, the British. Unless that hurdle is overcome, all the reports that the President is "leaning toward" airstrikes is meaningless. Moreover, while many of us in the United States Congress have urged that NATO conduct

something more than pinpricks, we must realize that the robust use of NATO air power now is an appropriate, if overdue, reaction to Bosnian Serb action, but does not constitute a policy in and of itself.

Mr. President, what this bill does is commit the United States to leading the way and lifting the arms embargo, but going first does not mean going it alone.

Last fall, nearly 100 countries—nearly 100 countries—in the United Nations General Assembly voted in support of lifting the arms embargo—over 100 countries. It is not just the United States alone.

I believe if the United States was in the lead, others would follow. I believe a number of countries, in addition to the United States, would also provide military equipment or the funds to purchase such equipment.

I also would like to turn for a moment to the argument that UNPROFOR is neutral and lifting the arms embargo would eliminate that neutrality.

First I point out that the U.N. resolutions are clearly not neutral. In imposing sanctions on Serbia, they recognize who the aggressor is. In committing to protecting the safe havens, on paper, they are acknowledging that the Bosnians need protection from this aggression. Finally, in perpetuating neutrality on the ground operationally, the U.N. peacekeepers are helping the very aggressors that have threatened to attack not only the Bosnians but the United Nations as well. This is not only absurd but a moral outrage.

Finally, I would like to comment on the idea raised by some that there should be another cease-fire and more negotiations. It seems to me that for negotiations to be successful in Bosnia, there needs to be some leverage on the side of the Bosnians. Why should the Serbs agree to anything when they are given free rein to overrun U.N.-designated safe havens?

At this point, the only negotiations that the Serbs might be interested in are the talks to arrange the surrender of the Bosnians. Well, the Bosnians are not ready to surrender. They are ready to fight and die for their country, if we only let them. That is what this debate is about. It is not Democrat; it is not Republican; it is not about liberal or conservative; it is about the U.S. Senate speaking on a very important issue. I hope we can have the vote before we adjourn today.

RECESS UNTIL 5:15 P.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 5:15 p.m.

The motion was agreed to, and at 4:12 p.m., the Senate recessed until 5:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ABRAHAM).

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.